



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

delivered very confusedly and uncertainly, by which it appeared to be no Catholic doctrine; that the doctrine was so far from being firmly believed, that there was not the strictest person of the Carthusian or other orders, that should receive a plenary indulgence at the hour of death, that yet would not desire his brethren to pray for his soul, which is a plain argument he did not believe the validity of the indulgence: that many in the Court of Rome spoke more freely against them than he did; that the Pope's authority is very far from being infallible, or being averred as such in that church, as appeared by the divines at Paris condemning the Bull of Clement VI., about indulgences, wherein he took upon him to command the angels! and give plenary remission both from the fault and punishment, which authorized Bulls were then to be seen at Vienna, Lemoges, and Poictou."*

In Spain indulgences were condemned by Petrus de Osma, a divine of Salamanca, and his followers, as appears by the Pope's Bull against him in 1478: and in Germany Johannes Burchardus de Vesaliâ, a famous preacher of Mentz, proclaimed that indulgences were only pious frauds and ways to deceive the people, and that they were fools who went to Rome for them.† The celebrated Gerson (John Charlier), one of the most eminent and excellent ecclesiastics of his time (he died in 1429), who was ambassador from the King of France at the Council of Constance, and one of the principal speakers on all matters of doctrine and discipline in that Council, and acknowledged by Cardinal Zabarella as the most excellent doctor of all Christendom, in writing on indulgences, boldly asserts, "that none can give a pardon for so many years as are contained in the Pope's indulgences but Christ alone."‡ And Cardinal Bellarmine himself, in his treatise on indulgences, lib. i., c. 12, confesses "that it were better if the church were very sparing in giving indulgences; and that he would not have the people too confident of the effect of them: for though the church may have power to give indulgences, yet they want their effect in particular persons; and therefore all prudent Christians do so receive indulgences as withal to satisfy God themselves for their sins;" which looks very like a statement that wise and prudent persons did not and ought not to rely on them.

Where such eminent Roman Catholic writers are thus opposed to trusting to the efficacy of indulgences, it would, we think, require very clear evidence to establish their validity to any mind not predetermined to adopt and believe in them. Whether any such clear proof is to be found of their validity, we are prevented by our limited space from discussing at present, but hope to proceed to consider it in our next number.

CAUTION.

INFORMATION having been received, and several complaints made, that the CATHOLIC LAYMAN newspaper has been destroyed or wilfully detained in some of the country Post-offices; and complaints having been made at the General Post-office to that effect; our readers are requested to call the attention of country Postmasters to the danger of conniving at such practices, by which they not only incur the forfeiture of their offices, but both they and every person who shall aid or counsel them in so doing incur the penalty of fine and imprisonment, with or without hard labour and solitary confinement, under the Post-office Offences' Act, 1 Vict., c. 36, which enacts as follows:—

1 VICT., C. 36, POST-OFFICE OFFENCES.

"Sec. 32. And for the protection of printed votes and proceedings in parliament, and printed newspapers, sent by the post, be it enacted, That every person employed in the Post-office who shall steal, or shall, for any purpose, embezzle, secrete, or destroy, or shall wilfully detain or delay, in course of conveyance or delivery thereof by the post, any printed votes or proceedings in parliament, or any printed newspaper, or any other printed paper whatever sent by the post, without covers or in covers, open at the sides, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, being convicted thereof, shall suffer such punishment, by fine or imprisonment, or by both, as to the court shall seem meet."

"Secs. 35 and 36. And be it enacted, That every person who shall aid, abet, counsel, or procure the commission of any misdemeanor, under the Post-office Acts, shall be liable to be indicted and punished as a principal offender; and every person who shall solicit or endeavour to procure any other person to commit a felony or misdemeanor, punishable by the Post-office Acts, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor; and being thereof convicted, shall be liable, at the discretion of the court, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years."

"Sec. 42. And be it enacted, That where a person

shall be convicted of an offence punishable under the Post-office Acts, for which imprisonment may be awarded, the court may sentence the offender to be imprisoned, with or without hard labour, in the common gaol or house of correction, and may also direct that he shall be kept in solitary confinement for the whole or any portion of such imprisonment as to the court shall seem meet."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st. No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

Communications from Mr. Colton, and several others, have been received, but necessarily postponed for want of room.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JANUARY, 1853.

WE appear before our readers again at the commencement of our second year, having surmounted the difficulties which attach to the commencement of every undertaking, and we pause to look back on our past labours, and to look forward to the work before us.

The success of our exertions so far has only increased the intensity of our desire to proceed with candour and the spirit of love; and we would earnestly entreat all our correspondents, for the year to come, to try and write under the influence not only of kindness, but sincere love for souls, and a desire to promote our salvation in the great day, as we shall strive to do by them.

In this spirit we have already discussed many solemn questions, of the deepest interest—the present state of our departed friends—our own future prospects when we shall have followed them to the grave—our means of arriving at the knowledge of the truth here, and of obtaining the inheritance of the blessed hereafter. And we trust and believe that we have already aided some of our readers in clearing up at least some difficulties, and removing some errors.

We hope we have also led many to think more deeply and more seriously of the necessity of seeking for truth, and detecting error; and in proportion as we may have accomplished this, we feel our responsibility increased to exhibit truth as well as expose error.

In our laborious search after truth during the past year, we have been compelled to reject much which assumed its name, but none of those who have watched our progress, can suspect that we would leave them, without guide or compass, in the dismal abysses of unbelief. We bless God, that so far have our free inquiries been from leading us into the dank and foggy region of infidelity or scepticism, that they have led us to the deep conviction, that Christianity is the only system of true philosophy ever yet presented to the world, the true source and sole support of all that is great and good in the human mind. The religion of Christ we unhesitatingly believe to be the religion of God himself, the great source of light and life; and if we devote so much pains and thought to show the uncertainty and inconsistency of doctrines which we believe to be mere human additions to Christ's religion, it is that we may endeavour to restore to our fellow-countrymen

the sublime and pure religion of our most Blessed Redeemer in its original simplicity and beauty, and assist in relieving men's consciences from burdens which they are not able to bear. The religion of Christ we firmly and practically believe to be not only the religion of truth and holiness, but the only "service which is perfect freedom." "Come unto me," says the Redeemer, "all ye who travail and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

We would, therefore, commence our second year's labours with the language of hope. To a man groping in the dark and dismal caverns of doubt and ignorance, how discouraging the gloom and uncertainty around, how sad the forebodings of dangers and difficulties beyond! How needful that he should have some one at hand to cheer and encourage him in his onward struggle to reach the light; and how exhilarating the first rays of sunshine which burst upon him, and gladden his heart with the hope of freedom and the enjoyment of the pure atmosphere of heaven.

Those who have long held religious opinions in which truth and error were mixed together are in some danger at first of rejecting all, when they find some erroneous. This danger belongs not to religion alone, but to all inquiries after truth upon any subject. Shall we, therefore, cease to seek for truth, or cease to expose error? A world of moral and intellectual darkness would be the result; for error increases of itself, truth only by the search for it. No man need seek for error or ignorance to find it; but truth must be sought. The indolent and cowardly will increase in error, and lose the little truth they have. Let us only believe that God will grant his truth to them that seek it; let us lay hold on every truth we find, and trust in him for more.

Our own experience has convinced us that there is a clear and marked line between truth and error. It has convinced us, too, that those who cannot yet trace the line between them may still see that there are great and glorious truths on one side, and dark and dreadful errors on the other; and this latter distinction is the most necessary for man. Who can draw the line where daylight fades into the night? But can we not distinguish light from darkness? Can we never say "it is day" or "it is night" till we have fixed the precise boundary between? And yet there is a line between truth and error, and we may find it, too, if we proceed diligently and honestly in the serious search for it.

While meditating on this most interesting subject, we were struck with the sound sense and truth of the following impressive passage from an eminent Roman Catholic divine, which we shall give our readers *verbatim*, as expressing our own ideas more effectively than any language we could use ourselves, and we earnestly invite their most serious attention to it:—

"It is obvious to common sense, that, in order to find out any hidden thing, or to do any difficult thing, we must first discover, and then follow, a proper rule or method for such purpose. If we get hold of a wrong clue, we shall never extricate ourselves from a labyrinth. If we do not take the right road to any distant place, it cannot be expected that we should arrive at it. The importance of adopting a right rule or method for discovering religious truth, must be admitted by all thinking Christians; as it is evident that a right rule alone can conduct them to truth, and that a false rule is liable to conduct them into all sorts of errors. Yet, how few are there who follow a rational rule or method for the discovery of the true religion! In their other affairs, mankind are anxious to find, and careful to follow, a safe and adequate rule of acting: but how few are found equally anxious and careful, in the most important of all their affairs!

"Some persons choose their religion as they do

* Wessel. Epist. contra Jacobum Hoek de Indulgentiis.

† Serran. Rerum Moguntium, lib. 1, c. 34, p. 143. Mogunt. Ed., 1604.

‡ Gerson. de Indulg. Consid. 8. Opera, tom. 1, lib. 17, p. CLXV. Antwerp, 1706.

their clothes, by the mere *rule* of their fancy. They are pleased, for example, with the talents of a preacher, and presently adopt his creed. Many others adhere to their religious system merely because they were educated in it, and because it was that of their parents and family, which, if it were a reasonable *rule* of acting, would equally excuse Jews, Turks, and Pagans for persisting in their respective impiety, and would impeach the preaching of Christ and his apostles. Others, again, glory in their religion, because it is the one established in this their country, so renowned for science, literature, and arms: not reflecting that the polished and conquering nations of antiquity—the Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans—were left, by the inscrutable judgments of God, in *darkness and the shadow of death*, while a poor, oppressed, and despised people, on the banks of the Jordan, were the only depositary of Divine truth, and the sole truly enlightened nation. But the greater part, even of Christians, of every denomination, making the business of eternity subservient to that of time, profess the religion which best accords with the *rule* of their interest, their prejudice, or their convenience. Thus, guided by mere fancy, or bewildered in the mists of prejudice, or blinded by worldly considerations, *they know not whither they go*.—John xii. 35. They may fondly flatter themselves that they are walking in the way of truth and life: *but there is a way that seemeth right to a man, the ends whereof lead to death*.—Prov. xvi. 25. They may persuade themselves that they adopt a sufficiently rational *rule* for discovering religious truth, that they have sufficient and safe *grounds* for the religion they profess: but the *rule* they adopt is but the *rule* of their own self-love; the *grounds* of their religion may be but the *delusions* of their own insincerity. In the meantime, they reflect not, or scarcely reflect, that the matter is of infinite consequence, that, in adopting a *rule of faith*, their immortal souls are at stake; that the religion chosen by this *rule* is connected with their eternal interests.*

It is hard to make those see who have determined to close their eyes, or to see only through the eyes of another; but we have ample means of knowing that it is not so with all. Fellow-countrymen, have you courage to examine and think for yourselves, in a matter where your immortal souls are indeed at stake, and where, if you follow mere fancy, or allow yourselves to be bewildered by the mists of educational prejudice, or blinded by worldly considerations, you may at last find yourselves, when it is too late, in the way that leads to death? Brother laymen, will you aid in the struggle to cast off a yoke which is too heavy for you to bear, or will you tamely bow your necks to the despots of Rome, who would subjugate all mankind to blind obedience to their tyrannical will? We trust the day is approaching when you will take the written Word of the living God as your guide, and disenthral yourselves from an ignominious and servile obedience to an Italian priest; and then may our beloved country be again what once she was—

"Great, glorious, and free—
First flower of the earth—first gem of the sea."

THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Continued from vol. i, page 125.)

OBJECTION 22.—Most Protestants are of opinion that children may be saved without baptism; and that persons grown up may be saved, though they neither are baptized nor desire to be baptized, but even refuse it, as *Quakers*.

Their Bible tells them, in plain terms (John iii. 5)—*Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God*.

REPLY.—It is rather bold to say this of "most Protestants," since it is well known that all Protestants (except the *Quakers*) do baptize; which they certainly

would not, if they regarded it as a matter of no consequence.

But, at all events, this objection does not affect the Church of England, which, in her Catechism, pronounces baptism to be "generally necessary to salvation."

OBJECTION 23.—Protestants deny that the grace of the Holy Ghost is given by the imposition of the bishop's hands in *confirmation*.

Their Bible teaches that it is (*Acts viii. 15, 17*), where *Peter and John confirmed the Samaritans. They prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost*.

REPLY.—If you read the Confirmation Service of the Church of England you will see that that rite is there represented as a means of grace. But, as for the "Holy Ghost," in the sense in which it is spoken of in the 8th of *Acts* (that is, the *miraculous gifts*, such as the gift of tongues, the gift of prophecy, and many others which the apostles conferred by the imposition of their hands—*Acts xix. 6*), this, it is plain, is *not* conferred by the imposition of hands of any bishop—Protestant or Roman Catholic—in these days.

OBJECTION 24.—Protestants deny that the blessed Sacrament, which Christ gave at his last supper, was the *body and blood of Christ*.

Their Bible affirms it in Christ's own express words (*Matt. xxvi. 26, 28*)—*This is my body—This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins. Luke xxii. 16, 20—This is my body which is given for you—This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you*. See also to the same effect *Mark xiv. 22, 24*, and *1 Cor. xi. 24, 25*.

REPLY.—Whether the objector has here stated fairly the opinions of the Church of England, he has enabled his readers to judge by what he says in *Objection 28*—"Their own catechism expressly teaches that the *body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper*."

As for the words "This is my body," &c., it must be borne in mind that Protestants do not *deny* the truth of anything that Jesus and his apostles said. The only question between them and Roman Catholics is about the *meaning* of it—whether such and such passages are to be understood literally, or figuratively.

The disciples did not *deny* the truth of John the Baptist's words when he called our Lord "the Lamb of God," although they did not believe that He was literally a lamb; nor did they deny the truth of our Saviour's own words—"I am the true vine," "I am the door," "I am the good shepherd," &c.—although they did not understand Him to mean that He was a literal tree, bearing real leaves and literal bunches of grapes, or that He was an actual door, or that his occupation was keeping actual sheep, &c.

Protestants, then, do not deny the truth of the words used by our Saviour at the institution of the Eucharist, although they are content to understand them in the same sense in which they must have been understood by the apostles to whom they were addressed. For the apostles, who had not been perplexed when they heard our Lord speak of himself as a *door*, a *shepherd*, a *vine*, &c., would certainly not understand at the time that, by the words, "This is my body," our Saviour meant to convey that He was holding his own body in his own hands, and eating it in their company. And if they subsequently received any further revelation, informing them that they had been before mistaken in the meaning which they had attached to the words of institution, it is strange that they should never have recorded so very wonderful a revelation.

And Roman Catholics themselves must maintain that the words of institution cannot be understood absolutely literally; since, if we understand these words in their most literal sense, we must believe that it is the *cup*, and not the wine in it, which is changed into blood.

OBJECTION 25.—Protestants deny that the *bread which Christ gave was his flesh*, the same which he gave for the life of the world.

Their Bible affirms it (*John vi. 51*)—*The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world*.

OBJECTION 26.—Protestants deny that *Christ's flesh is meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed*.

Their Bible expressly affirms it (*John iv. 55*)—*My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed*.

REPLY.—Before Roman Catholics assert that the Protestant opinions concerning the Eucharist are condemned by the 6th of John, they ought at least to agree among themselves whether this chapter relates to the Eucharist at all. We have already quoted (see vol. i., pp. 34, 46) high Roman Catholic authorities who hold that it did not, as well as the admission of the Council of Trent (session 21, c. i.), that this was a point on which the Fathers differed.

OBJECTION 27.—Protestants are apt to say, with the unbelieving *Jews* (*John vi. 52*)—*How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* and (verse 60), *This is a hard saying, and who can hear it?*

Christ, in their own Bible, assures them (*John iv. 53, 54, 56*)—*Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have*

no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.

REPLY.—The eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood, spoken of in this text, is described as such that he who eateth "hath eternal life," but he who eateth not hath "no life in him." Protestants, therefore, conclude that it does not mean the mere receiving of the Eucharist, since it is acknowledged that many receive the Eucharist who do not obtain eternal life, but, on the contrary, thereby increase their condemnation. But if Roman Catholics suppose the verse to refer to the Eucharist, why do they withhold the cup from the laity, since it says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood ye have no life in you?"

OBJECTION 28.—Protestants deny that the *cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ*; or that the *bread which we break in the blessed sacrament is the communion of the body of Christ*.

Their Bible expressly affirms it (*1 Cor. x. 16*)—*The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? And what makes them more inexcusable in denying it is, that their own catechism expressly teaches them, that the *body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper**.

REPLY.—The objector has here answered himself by showing that the Church of England does not contradict the assertion of St. Paul, but makes a statement in strict accordance with it. And Protestants appeal to this very passage as one of the proofs against transubstantiation, since Paul here expressly calls the consecrated elements *BREAD*.

OBJECTION 29.—Protestants teach, that to the unworthy communicant the sacrament is no more than bare bread and wine, and by no means the body and blood of Christ.

Their Bible assures them of the contrary, when it tells them (*1 Cor. xi. 27, 29*) that the unworthy communicant is *guilty of the body and blood of our Lord*; and that he receives *damnation to himself, not discerning the body of our Lord*. For how should he be *guilty of the body and blood of our Lord* if what he took were no more than bread and wine? And how hard a case would it be that he should be damned for not discerning the *body of our Lord*, which, in the opinion of these gentlemen, is not at all there?

REPLY.—The objector here is guilty of practising a remarkable artifice. He leaves out half the text, and says "the unworthy communicant" is guilty of the body and blood of our Lord. He evidently wished to keep out of sight that St. Paul wrote, "Whosoever shall eat this *BREAD* or drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." If Paul had held Romish views he should have written, "Whosoever shall eat the *body* and drink the *blood* of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty," &c. But then he would have contradicted the verse cited in *Objection 28*—*"Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life."*

Every one must perceive that, by "discerning the Lord's body," Paul could not have meant discerning it by the bodily senses, since even Roman Catholics admit that a consecrated and an unconsecrated wafer are perfectly undistinguishable by the senses. Protestants do not believe, nor do they suppose Paul to have meant, that a man would be condemned for eating, without any reverence, a piece of consecrated bread which had come in his way by some accident, without his knowing anything of its consecration. But Paul is evidently speaking of those Corinthians who came together to *celebrate the Lord's Supper*, and yet ate and drank irreverently, as at an ordinary meal, without considering the solemnity of the Service and the great event it was intended to commemorate. Persons who do so, Protestants consider as guilty of a great sin, and they do not consider them as in any way partakers of Christ; because they consider this partaking as a benefit and blessing reserved for those who have faith in Christ and true devotion. Augustine, whom the Roman Catholics venerate as a saint, expressly declared this, and denies that the body and blood of Christ are in any sense received by the irreligious.

But they can have better assurance than any Roman Catholic can have, that, if they are truly devout believers, they are partakers of Christ in the sense which He himself meant when they reverently celebrate the Eucharist; for it is expressly declared by the Council of Trent, and in other authoritative documents of the Church of Rome, that the *inward intention* of the priest is essential to the true consecration, as well as the pronouncing of the words. If, therefore, a priest should chance to be an infidel in his heart, which is but too possible, (and no human being can be certain of the contrary), the wafer remains mere bread; and no Roman Catholic, therefore, can be at all certain that he is partaking in any way of Christ's body, or that he is not worshipping a piece of mere bread.

OBJECTION 30.—Protestants, to excuse their unbelief of the *real presence* of the body and blood of Christ in the blessed sacrament, pretend that it is impossible his

* Rev. Samuel Jones's Epitome of the Right Rev. Dr. Milner's End of Controversy, pp. 9-10.